

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-4 are amended, and claims 5-10 are added.

Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending in this application. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 4 is amended to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant understands that claim 4 is otherwise allowable since claim 4 is not rejected over prior art.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,188 B1 to Maehara. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a surface of a lens is etched to reduce an optical thickness. This feature is described in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 18-22.

The Office Action asserts that Maehara discloses, in Figs. 3A-3H and at col. 4, lines 1-62, etching a surface of an optical component (a binary optics element 35c and film 36) to reduce an optical thickness. However, the binary optics element of Maehara utilizes a diffraction action, which is completely different from a lens which utilize a refraction action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the optical component disclosed by Maehara is not a lens. Accordingly, Maehara does not disclose etching a surface of a lens to reduce the optical thickness of the lens as recited in claim 1. Thus claim 1 is patentable over Maehara.

Claim 2 recites that a mounting surface of an optical component is etched to adjust the position of the optical component. This feature is described in the specification at, for example, page 17, line 22-page 18, line 25 and shown in Fig. 5. As described, the adjustment portion 37 is etched to adjust the position of the optical component (e.g., a lens 31).

Maehara discloses etching the top surface of a binary optics element 35c to form an eight-level structure. However, Maehara does not teach or suggest etching a mounting

surface of the binary optics element 35c, nor does it teach or suggest adjusting the position of the binary optics element 35c.

Accordingly, claim 2 is also patentable over Maehara.

Claim 3 is allowable at least for its dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites.

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.


Claims 5-10 are added.

Claim 5 recites that the lens is manufactured before etching the surface of the lens. Claim 6 recites that the etching is performed to bring an optical thickness of the manufactured lens to a target optical thickness of the lens. Claim 7 recites that the lens comprises a convex surface and a planar surface, and that the planar surface is etched to reduce the optical thickness. Claims 8-10 recite a lens whose optical thickness has been adjusted by a method according to claims 5-7, respectively. These features are described in the specification, for example, page 13, lines 18-22. These claims are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Klifton L. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

MAC:KLK/aaw

Date: September 30, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--